UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,286	10/10/2001	Christopher Peiffer	1014-152US01	9849

28863   7590   02/22/2007

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P. A.
1625 RADIO DRIVE
SUITE 300
WOODBURY, MN 55125

EXAMINER
PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/975,286	PEIFFER, CHRISTOPHER
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7,8,11-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-26 are subject to examination. Claims 6, 9, 10 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/30/2006, pages 8-15, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-26 is maintained.

Applicant argures, the cited arts do not disclose / suggest / teach the limitations related to the additional limitations due to the amendment on 11/30/2006 to the claims.

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The claims have been amended along with newly presented limitations that ulters the scope of the invention (please see the claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-26), which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action), necessitated by the applicant's amendment to the claims. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Amended claims 1, 24, 25, 26 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling.

Regarding claims 1, 24, 25, 26 and its dependent claims, storage such as memory to retain/hold the database, usage of some network and some network interface card to receive the

network message, usage of the computer to process the network message and usage of some

network interface card to output the response from the network device are critical or essential to

the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure.

See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Without using the storage such

as memory it is not possible to store/retain/hold the database. Without using the some network

and some network interface card it is not possible to receive the network message. Without

using the computer (and computer network, claim 25, and computing system claim 26) it is not

possible to process the network message. Without using some network interface card it is not

possible to output the response from the network device. Further, it is not possible to store the

database on a network device. The database cannot exist by itself.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Branstad in view of Fielding, Smith et al., 6,377,991 (Hereinafter Smith) and

"Official Notice".

Note: Regarding the applicant's usage of "wherein" and/or "whereby" and/or "adapted

to" and/or "adapted for" in the claimed subject matter of the claims, the claim scope is not

limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be

performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure. Please see

Minton v. Nat 'l Ass 'n of Securities Dealers, Inc., 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620

(Fed. Cir. 2003)), MPEP 2111.

6.   As per claim 1, Branstad discloses a computer-implemented method for comparing (e.g.,

col., 21, lines 21 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) an unknown string (e.g., string with or without

errors, figure 12, col., 3, lines 9 - 39) to a string (e.g., col., 3, lines 26 – 38), the method

comprising:

        storing, on a network device, a database containing a plurality of predefined strings,

wherein the predefined strings stored within the database represent known headers for a network

communication protocol (col., 21, lines 3 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48);

        receiving, with the network device, a network message (col., 21, lines 3 – 27, col., 3,

lines 35 – 48);

        in response to receiving the network message, selecting one of the plurality of predefined

strings stored within the database of the network device (e.g., col., 3, lines 26 – 38);

        identifying a portion of the network message as an unknown string for comparison with

the selected predefined string (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48);

        performing a bitwise exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21, col., 21, lines 21

– 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) on a segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) and

a segment of the selected predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) ; and

        identifying string match based on the exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21).

Bradstad also discloses exclusive OR operation between the two strings (e.g., block 1756, block 1760, figure 17B) and a result of the exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2-21, figure 17B, note: it is also inherent that an exclusive OR operation produces a result).

However, Branstad does not specifically mention about usage of strings having an ASCII binary representation and string being a case-insensitive string.

Fielding discloses well-known usage of strings having an ASCII (e.g., section 3.4, page 4) binary representation (e.g., section 14.15, page 16) and string being a case-insensitive string (e.g., section 3.4, page 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad with the teachings of Fielding in order to facilitate usage of strings having an ASCII binary representation and string being a case-insensitive string because the ASCII binary representation would help support communicating information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

Branstad and Fielding do not specifically mention about applying a predefined flag to the result and to produce an indication.

However, Smith discloses the well-known concept applying a predefined flag to the result and to produce an indication (e.g., col., 15, lines 17 – 62, figures 3, 5-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad and Fielding with the teachings of Smith in order to facilitate usage of applying a predefined flag to the result and to produce an indication because the predefined flag would support deciding what the result value is from the possible result

values of the result. The indication would enhance supporting the communicating information, as it would provide information on whether the string match has occurred or not.

Branstad, Fielding and Smith do disclose the string being predefined, performing a bitwise operation between the predefined flag and the result and comparing the predefined flag and a result of the bitwise operation.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing usage of the string being predefined, performing a bitwise operation between the predefined flag and the result and comparing the predefined flag and a result of the bitwise operation, wherein the indication for the case-insensitive string match indicates whether all characters of the unknown string within the network message match all corresponding characters of the selected predefined string so as to match one of the known headers, processing the network message based on the indication of the match and outputting a response from the network device based on the processed network message is well known and expected in the art. For example, Rob Saccoccio, "Case insensitive compare when getting environment headers", Wed, 6, Jun 2001, Chelsea.net, pages 1 and 2, (Hereinafter Rob-Saccoccio) discloses these limitations along with clear motivation to overcome HTTP 1.1 specification with a fix for a need for case insensitive compare for the HTTP headers, please see page 1. Eric Sit, "Case insensitive compare when getting environment headers", Mon, 4, Jun 2001, pages 1 and 2, (Hereinafter Eric-Sit) discloses these limitations along with clear motivation to overcome HTTP 1.1 specification with a fix for a need for case insensitive compare for the environment strings, please see pages 1 and 2. Smith et al., U. S. Publication 2005/0246716, Microsoft Corporation, also discloses these limitations,

please see paragraphs, 28768, 28759, 19857, 19860-19864, 19874-19899, 68, 77, 14441, 14435, 20109-20115, 22, 30552, 29045-29045.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include usage of the string being predefined, the a bitwise operation between the predefined flag and the result and comparing the predefined flag and a result of the bitwise operation, wherein the indication for the case-insensitive string match indicates whether all characters of the unknown string within the network message match all corresponding characters of the selected predefined string so as to match one of the known headers, processing the network message based on the indication of the match and outputting a response from the network device based on the processed network message with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate the bitwise operation and the comparison because the bitwise operation and the comparison would provide further comparison of the value of the strings (including predefined string) that are used for the bitwise operation and the comparison. The operations on the strings that are used for comparison would provide whether a case-insensitive match is occurred or not among the strings and would support processing the network message.

7.   As per claim 2, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

identifying a segment of the selected predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) and identifying a segment of the unknown string (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) for comparison (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48) with the identified segment of the selected predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27).

8.   As per claims 3, 20, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

the segment of the predefined string and the segment of the unknown string contain a

same number of characters, the lengths of each of the strings are equal (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 –

48).

9.   As per claim 5, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. Fielding also discloses usage of a case-insensitive (e.g., section 3.4, page 4) segment

match (e.g., section 14.16, page 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate usage

of a case-insensitive segment match because the segment and would help support communicating

information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The case-insensitive

implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

10.   As per claim 8, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. Branstad also discloses usage identifying a subsequent segment of the selected

predefined string (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27) and a subsequent segment of the unknown string

(e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34) for comparison (e.g., col., 3, lines 35 – 48).

11.   As per claims 14-17, 19, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. Fielding also discloses the segments each include one character (e.g., section

14.2, page 2) / four characters (e.g., section 14.19, page 19, section 14.23, page 21), the unknown

string including an HTTP header field (e.g., section, 14.1, page 1), the predefined string is from a

table of predetermined HTTP header fields (e.g., section 14, page 1, section 14.1, page 1, section

14.2, page 2), identifying the length of strings (e.g., section 14.13, page 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate each of

the segments each include one character / four characters, the unknown string including an

HTTP header field, the predefined string is from a table of predetermined HTTP header fields

and identifying the length of strings because the character / four characters, HTTP header field,

predetermined HTTP header field and the length of strings would enhance communicating

information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The case-insensitive

implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase or lowercase.

12.   As per claims 22 and 23, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. Fielding also discloses determining if characters of the strings are within a

predefined ASCII range (e.g., section 14.24, page 22, section 14.27, page 25), characters not

within the predefined ASCII range causes to yield a negative string match (e.g., section 14.26,

page 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate

determining if characters of the strings are within a predefined ASCII range and characters not

within the predefined ASCII range causes to yield a negative string match because usage of the

determination of characters within a predefined ASCII range and the negative string would

enhance communicating information among two entities using the ASCII character set. The

case-insensitive implementation would support usage of characters regardless of their uppercase

or lowercase.

13.   As per claim 4, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. Branstad also discloses left-shifting the content of the segments if the segments contain

less than predetermined number of string contents (e.g., col., 22, lines 3 – 39).

However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about shifting when

less than four characters exist.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing usage of

shifting when less than four characters exist is well known and expected in the art. For example,

Thinkage GCOS8 SS C Reference Manual, pages 1-71, 1996, discloses usage of these

limitations, e.g., section, 2.7, page 6, section, 4.7, page 34, section, 4.12, page 36.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to include the well-known concept of shifting when less than four characters with the

teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate shifting when less than four

characters exist because the shifting would enhance supporting decoding information. The

compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

14.   As per claims 7 and 13, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined value 0x20202020. For example, Abgrall et al., 2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0x20202020 (0x20 for each byte), e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0x20202020 is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0x20202020 with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate using value 0x20202020 (as the predetermined value 0x20202020 represents four blank characters) would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

15.   As per claim 12, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined value 0x20.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0x20 is well known and expected in the art. For example, Abgrall et al., 2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0x20, e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0x20 with the

teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate using value 0x20 (as the predetermined value 0x20 represents blank character) would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

16.   As per claims 10, 18, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about the result is operated on in another bitwise operation.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing the result is operated on in another bitwise operation is well known and expected in the art. For example, Kontio et al., 2005/0004875, January 6, 2005, discloses these limitations, e.g., paragraphs 54 and 55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing the result is operated on in another bitwise operation with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate further operating on the result because the another bitwise operation would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

17.   As per claim 11, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about predetermined value 0.

"Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing predetermined value 0 is well known and expected in the art. For example, Abgrall et al.,

2003/0037237, discloses the concept of using predetermined value 0, e.g., paragraphs 323 and 324.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the well-known concept of providing predetermined value 0 with the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith in order to facilitate shifting using value 0 (as the predetermined value 0 represents null value) would enhance supporting decoding information. The compared information would be used for utilizing the string information.

18.   Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad, Fielding, Smith and "Official Notice" in view of Slater et al., 6,654,796, Cisco (Hereinafter Slater)

19.   As per claim 21, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about WAN.

Slater discloses the network being WAN (e.g., col., 1, lines 55 – 67, col.,9, lines 42 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith with the teachings of Slater in order to facilitate the network being WAN because the WAN would support communicating string information from one entity to another entity. The entity over the WAN would support exclusive OR operation.

20.   Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branstad, Fielding, Smith and "Official Notice" in view of James et al., 6,523,108 (Hereinafter James).

21.   As per claim 24, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. Branstad also discloses the following:

use in a computer network (e.g., col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21 - 34) and

the corresponding characters (e.g., col., 10, lines 9 – 34).

However, Branstad, Fielding and Smith do not specifically mention about performing OR

operation.

James discloses the well-known concept of performing the bitwise OR operation (usage

of logical OR gate 117).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Branstad, Fielding and Smith with the teachings of James

in order to facilitate usage of performing the bitwise OR operation because the bitwise OR

operation would enhance deciding whether both the bits are having a value of "1" or not. The

outcome of the bitwise OR operation i.e., "1" or "0" or would enhance informing for the string

that would help support communicating information between two entities.

22.   As per claim 25, Branstad, Fielding, Smith and James disclose the claimed limitations as

rejected above. Branstad also discloses the following:

a computer networking device for improving data transfer via a computer network (e.g.,

col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21 - 34)

storing, on a network device, a database containing a plurality of known HTTP headers

(col., 21, lines 3 – 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48);

receiving, with the network device, a client HTTP header (col., 21, lines 3 – 27, col., 3,

lines 35 – 48);

in response to receiving the the client HTTP header, selecting one of the known HTTP

headers stored within the database of the network device (e.g., col., 3, lines 26 – 38);

performing a bitwise exclusive OR operation (e.g., col., 22, lines 2 – 21, col., 21, lines 21

– 27, col., 3, lines 35 – 48) on a segment of the client HTTP header (e.g., col., 19, lines 19 – 34)

and the known HTTP header selected from the database (e.g., col., 20, lines 18 – 27).

23.   As per claim 26, Branstad, Fielding and Smith disclose the claimed limitations as rejected

above. Branstad also discloses the following:

an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium having a plurality of machine-

readable instructions executed by a computing system (e.g., col., 1, lines 36 – 54, col., 3, lines 21

- 34).

Conclusion

24.   The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and

not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. For example, Narin,

2002/0091755 discloses usage of number of predefined headers along with supplemental

headers. Brown, 5,740,361, discloses string bits / header authentication using HTTP protocol and

headers like Accept-Encoding, WWW-Authenticate by XORing several times and using, for

example, one-character string "/" for "http://www.foo.com" string over the Internet.

Mitzenmacher et al., 5,953,503, discloses HTTP headers with ASCII characters with preset

dictionaries.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or

sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the

convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings

of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages

and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by

the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

February 16, 2007